

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 93 15:12:46 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #274  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 31 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    274

Today's Topics:

                    ARRL and \*its\* members  
                    ARRL and it's members  
                    Code/NoCode (2 msgs)  
                    Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
                    How do I identify in the USA with a reciprocal permit  
                    Real CBers (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 30 Jul 93 11:38:07 GMT  
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL and \*its\* members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <239cn9INNuf7@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)  
writes:

>>[If the] FCC required all amateurs, as a prerequisite to licensing, to be  
>>a full, paid-up member of the ARRL, I would leave the hobby.  
>

>This is weird. Would you leave the hobby if you had to pay \$30/yr for  
>your license? This is about the annual cost in the UK and Australia,  
>and I have never heard of anyone getting out of the hobby because of it.

There was a time when the license fee was raised to \$20 US. Being a  
very young person with very little money (\$20 was a \_fortune\_) I bitched  
and moaned, but I paid it.

I think the previous poster objects to the requirement of ARRL membership. I would, too. I've disagreed with most everything the ARRL has ever done (though there have been some good things, too, IMHO they're in the minority). I have never been, nor do I intend to be, an ARRL member; were it made a requirement, I would sooner join the Aryan movement if it were offered as an alternative.

Your mileage may vary, but that's where I personally stand. And I believed the original poster had the same idea when I read what he posted.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|  WA9PDM      |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

-----

Date: 29 Jul 93 13:22:00 EDT  
From: pacbell.com!iggy.GW.Vitalink.COM!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!  
psinntp!arrl.org@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>

>An interesting footnote: in 1975, ARRL membership (with QST) was \$7.50.

OK, so ARRL membership costs four times now what it did then. And the point is... what, exactly?

I still remember my first new car, a 1975 VW Rabbit for which I paid, I think, \$3600. Priced a VW lately?

-----

```
Jon Bloom, KE3Z                | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League    |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |
```

-----

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 1993 11:43:33 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Code/NoCode  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever) writes:

>In fact, if the

>no-code license hadn't brought more people like me into the hobby,

>how many bands do you think you'd have left.

Since most of the no-clue licensees hang out exclusively on 2 meters, clearly the no-clue license has done little to "save our bandwidth" by populating those bands we were "in danger of losing" with new, no-clue hams. Your insinuation that without the no-clue license we would have less bandwidth is false.

>It amazes me how many  
>hams believe that rag-chewing is the sole purpose of the amateur  
>community.

Some people like to rag-chew. Others like public service. Yet others like DX chasing. Some like contesting. To each his own.

>We have had ARES active  
>here in Cleveland the past two days, and the sad fact is that all but  
>two of the amateurs involved the past two days have been no-coders.

When you get right down to it, what has ARES done in your area that normal emergency services crews can't do better and more efficiently?

In this area, ARES is a joke. The section Emergency Coordinator rarely shows up for the statewide ARES net. Nobody has a clue as to what is going on. The last ARES net had two net-controls on the same repeater (when I asked "why", I was told "so someone who can't hear our net-control-south might be able to hear our net-control-north". Duhhh... McFly! Get a clue. Its a damn \*repeater\*. It has a defined coverage area. Everyone will be able to hear n-c-south.)

I am very good friends with several law enforcement officials, many involved with disaster relief. Their opinion of ham-radio emergency services is all the same: its a waste. In fact, many believe that hams actually create \*more\* work for them, because with a bunch of untrained, i-think-i'm-so-important buffoons running around a disaster site, all they do is at the minimum get in the way of real disaster crews doing their job, and at the maximum end up getting themselves hurt or killed.

And, I won't even \*begin\* to tell you the story about the no-clue who volunteered for the ARES position of Kent County DEC and now drives around in a circa-1974 Ford Pinto with, yes, you guessed it, a bar of flashing lights on the roof. Can you say "police authority wannabe?" Good, I knew you could. (Ever wonder what the local authorities think when he shows up? I'll tell you: They chuckle. He's the laughing stock.)

When it comes to emergency services, amateurs have this noble,

conceited concept on how they are "so important" to the disaster relief effort of communities. I hate to break it to you, you're not.

MD

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 05:31:43 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!cleveland.Freenet.Edu!  
ak842@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Code/NoCode  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) says:

>  
> That's the kind of effort that one should put into getting an  
> amateur radio license. Thats what separates hr and CB. I think  
> the codeless tech license should be temporary! If u don't want  
> to put the effort into upgrading, T0000000000000 BAAAAAAAAAAD!!!!!!!!!!!!!!  
>  
>  
>73  
>KB1AMB/AA  
>

You know... I'm getting sick of hearing this line of crap.  
I got into amateur radio because I respected the public service aspect.  
I do SkyWarn. Pretty much any public service event I can find, and am also  
a member of ARES/RACES. (They're pretty much one-in-the-same here)

I don't need to know the code to do these events. In fact, if the  
no-code license hadn't brought more people like me into the hobby,  
how many bands do you think you'd have left. It amazes me how many  
hams believe that rag-chewing is the sole purpose of the amateur  
community. That's the sole purpose of the Children's Band. Yeah,  
the amateur bands are fun to play on, but the fact is that they are  
there to be utilized in an emergency situation. We have had ARES active  
here in Cleveland the past two days, and the sad fact is that all but  
two of the amateurs involved the past two days have been no-coders.  
Now you tell me who has no-clue.

(ARES has been active due to a severe T-storm that hit the east side  
of Cleveland with 90mph+ winds and heavy rains. Knocked all kinds  
of trees down, telephone poles... just about anything standing... even  
a 7 year old girl was picked up by a gust and she flew head-first into  
a truck driving down the road. Some places have not had  
electricity for over 48hours now and shouldn't expect it until

Sunday or Monday..... which means it's hard to keep reliable communications in the hardest hit areas)

73 de N8VUR

--

-- Douglas A. Dever -- ak842@po.cwru.edu 73 de N8VUR  
s9000159@llohoio.ll.pbs.org (Hate Mail to This Address Please)  
floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Fan Mail to This Address Please)  
QSO on 444.700/R or 146.82/R anytime!

-----

Date: 29 Jul 93 18:19:49  
From: korie!west.West.Sun.COM!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!  
appserv.Eng.Sun.COM!appserv!rfm@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <BioD8B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> :>Bullshit.

Not to mention inappropriate in the company of a young woman.

Haven't talked to many young women lately, have you?

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----

Date: 31 Jul 93 14:25:30 GMT  
From: noc.near.net!nic.umass.edu!risky.ecs.umass.edu!umaecs!manakkal@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: How do I identify in the USA with a reciprocal permit  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi All,

I have a reciprocal permit to operate here in the USA, and I was wondering how I should identify on the band. Does it change with the location of the station? I am currently located in Amherst, Massachusetts. I would also like to meet any hams who are located nearby.

73's

---Venkat . VU3MSV.

snail mail : 51 presidential apts,  
Amherst MA 01002  
LL : 413-549-8422  
e-mail : venkat@cs.umass.edu  
manakkal@ecs.umass.edu

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Jul 93 19:26:10 GMT  
From: psinntp!laidbak!tella5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gBgc8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:  
> cthomas@athena.mit.edu (Michael T Ford) writes:  
>  
>> In article <CAso2z.F7H@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami K  
>> >  
>> >-. . . -.- -... .---- .- -- -... -...- .- .-  
>> >  
>>  
>> -. . -.. -.. -.. -. .- - ... -.. - . - .... . ..- .--. --. -. .- -.. .  
>> -. . .-- --.. ----- -. .  
>  
> Hummmmm....I always thought Morse was a aural language.  
>

Welllllll .... One of the more 'interesting' morse qso's I ever had was during my stint in the US Navy. The QSO took place between my ship and another which was 10 or so miles away. (Well over the horizon). The method was by illuminating clouds with Carbon-Arc signal lights which had code-key activated 'shutters'.

It wansn't 'ham radio' but it 'was' Morse Code. :-)

-----  
John Rice - K9IJ | "Did I say that ?" I must have, but It was  
rice@ttd.teradyne.com | MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially  
| Not my Employer's.... Licensed since 1959  
(708)-438-5065 - (bbs ) | Ex: K8YZR, KH6GHC, WB9CSP, W9MMB, WA1TXV

-----  
Date: 30 Jul 93 16:02:22 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Real CBers

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>

>>

>> ... .-- .- -- .. --- -- .-- --- -- .. -- .. --. .... - - .- --- -  
SWAMI , YOU MIGHT NOT

>> .-- .- -- - - --- ..- ... .-.- --- --. . .... - .-.- .  
WANT TO USE CODE SINCE

>> - ..... -.- --- -.-. .... .-.- --- --. .-.- --- .....  
THE NO CLUE LICENSEES

>> .-- --- -.- - .... .- ..... --. .- --- .-.- --- .. - .-.-.-  
WONT BE ABLE TO READ IT .

>> --.... --- -- -... .-.- --- - --- -.-. ....-.-  
73 DE KD1NR {AR} {SK}

>

> Once again, Tony, I think you have missed the point. CW is an aural mode,  
> and an attempt to emulate it in a visual way on a computer screen is  
> counterproductive. The quickest, and most efficient way for anyone to  
> learn Morse is through sound, not sight. Memorizing dots and dashes only  
> adds an unnecessary step in the decoding process, and limits the speed in  
> which one can comprehend. It is here that we stand in disagreement.

>

> --Robert

Please, get a sense of humor. The only reason I did that was to get  
people thinking. I have no problem decoding CW on the screen....

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com                      Soon W5YI VE
      \__/_/
      (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  ___  \/_/
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || {___} ||
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^
-----
```

Date: Thu, 29 Jul 93 18:05:24 GMT  
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.020659.17371@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbird.bbn.hp.com>, <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>~  
Subject : Re: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)

In article <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:  
>In article <CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbird.bbn.hp.com>, uweb@PROBLEM\_WITH\_INEWS\_GATEWAY\_FILE  
(Uwe\_Behle) writes:  
>|>  
[...]  
>|> rig comes from (the wall socket). I have noticed that the percentage  
>|> of knowledgeable people is very high among the high-speed cw ops. That  
>|> is one of the reasons for me to do mostly cw on hf bands.  
>|>  
>|> Uwe (DF3DU)  
>  
>--  
>Are you saying that knowing code has somehow imparted some  
>divine wisdom on those hams who operate at 20+WPM? I argue that these  
>same hams would have the same wisdom whether they knew/used code  
>or not.

You two are not in disagreement here...Uwe was pointing out a correlation,  
not a cause-effect relationship.

>knowledge of code and theory are totally separate issues.

Yes, they are.

To clarify my earlier point, the removal of the code requirement has enabled  
people who are incompetent in the \*theory\* portion to become no-code hams.  
This is due to the theory questions being too shallow and easy to memorize  
to be an effective test of knowledge.

Please don't construe this as an argument to continue CW testing on HF or  
eliminate the no-code license; the proper "fix" is to beef up the theory  
tests. With the theory tests as easy as they are however, the CW test is  
the only means we have to filter out the chuff. Once the theory tests have  
been beefed up, I would be behind removal of all CW requirements. But not  
before.

>One could also argue that the level of knowledge of electronic theory is  
>slipping, but knowledge of digital systems is certainly rising - which  
>goes along with how the rest of the world is going. Years ago, field



>engineers for most big computer companies would troubleshoot a board and  
>replace a component on the spot. Now, the new breed of "engineers" are  
>less knowledgeable about the individual components and simply treat whole  
>boards as components. And when the defective board is sent in, typically  
>it is either thrown away or the problem is found with a test jig. Someone  
>still has to program the test jigs and design the boards, but overall there  
>are probably fewer people who really understand the nitty-gritty. Even  
>those who design the boards have help from software tools. On the other  
>hand, understanding of digital logic has increased.

This is due at least partially to current manufacturing techniques, which  
make it much more difficult to repair a board at all. Overcoming difficulty  
costs \$\$, and with manufacturing costs dropping it is cheaper to replace  
the unit than to fix it. And if a board is spec'd to be the smallest FRU  
(Field Replaceable Unit), engineering is not going to bother to make it  
easy to repair. And why should the company train people in the nitty-gritty  
if it's not necessary? It's purely economic.

>I'm not sure whether this is progress or whether we are loosing valuable  
>skills.

Amateur radio is not the only industry afflicted with this. I think it is  
a direct result of technological progress. Look at personal computers. How  
many people really understand the workings of the machine they use everyday?  
Back when I first started in computers, Altair and Imsai were a couple of the  
bigger manufacturers of computers. I couldn't afford one, so I got an  
Ohio Scientific. These were very primitive machines, and if you wanted to  
use them for useful work you pretty much had to learn about their inner  
workings. Want an extra printer interface? Build one. Software? Write it  
yourself. The people involved with computers back then were a different  
breed than the ones who walk into CompUSA today and buy the latest multimedia  
super-machine. But I am a tinkerer at heart, so now that computers have  
gotten to the plug-n-play stage and my expectations of my computer far  
exceed my time available to tinker, I don't do computers for a hobby anymore.  
(well not as much anyway) I got into Amateur Radio because it offers an  
unlimited range of tinkering possibilities. Ok, if it makes you all feel  
better call it Experimentation. ;-)

--

[]	[]	[]	[]	Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ	NCR Torrey Pines
[]	[]	[]	[]	kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com	(619) 597-3602
[]	[]	[]	[]	kevin%beacons@cyber.net	
[]	[]	[]	[]		
[]	[]	[]	[]	Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.	

-----

Date: 31 Jul 93 01:46:24 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!  
perry@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <DRT.93Jul29102654@cacciatore.mit.edu>, <CAyD47.73H@fc.hp.com>,  
<1993Jul30.180041.11421@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>  
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

Kevin Sanders (kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com) wrote:

: This reminds me of something I heard from one of the Field Day old-timers  
: this year. Don't know if it's true, but he said the best field day call he  
: ever heard (in Morse) was

: dah-dit dah-dit dah-dit dah-dit dah-didi-dah-dit dah-dit

: Supposedly N9NN/9 :-)

: I don't know if this would be unique anymore... are there any NN9 calls?

Both N9NN and NN9N are in the callsign database. Who did you QSL to?

Perry  
AA0ET

-----  
Date: 30 Jul 93 16:12:25 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930728.114323.7q4.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>, <238345\$cp4@senator-  
bedfellow.MIT.EDU>, <1993Jul29.122119.9251@ee.surrey.ac.uk>  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

M.Willis@ee.surrey.ac.uk (Mike Willis) writes:

> Yes. CODELESS != CLUELESS.

>

>

> All this stuff amuses me as in the UK we have had a codeless licence for many  
> years. A large number of technical competants have taken advantage of this.  
> VHF upwards is so much more rewarding than HF.

Two things, this is the United States, not the United Kingdom and  
secondly, to each his own. Some people are perfectly happy to remain in  
VHF/UHF and others aren't.

The problem with this is that you get people who came in under the no-code license, then scream because they want HF access without any additional effort. Hence, clueless. :)

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
      \_____/
      (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  \_____/
 / | {MTV} || MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || { } ||
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^
-----
```

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 05:41:35 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!cleveland.Freenet.Edu!ak842@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul29.144058.479@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,  
<238r18\$41l@ornews.intel.com>, <CAyDzx.7M0@fc.hp.com>  
Reply-To : ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever)  
Subject : Re: Technicians can use CW, was Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In a previous article, perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) says:

```
>Jim Garver (zardoz@ornews.intel.com) wrote:
>: I can't see anything wrong with giving 10 meter CW privileges to those
>: who haven't demonstrated their skill yet.
>
>An international treaty is what's wrong HF ops without verified CW
>proficiency.
>
>Perry Scott
>AA0ET
>
```

While I agree with this.. and I don't think no-codes should have HF... allow me to play Devil's Advocate:

And Gee, look how Japan followed that treaty..... and look what happened.  
Not a damned thing.

```
--
__ Douglas A. Dever __      ak842@po.cwru.edu      73 de N8VUR
s9000159@llohoio.ll.pbs.org  (Hate Mail to This Address Please)
floyd@nraven.wariat.org      (Fan Mail to This Address Please)
QSO on 444.700/R or 146.82/R anytime!
```

Date: 30 Jul 93 16:08:41 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAso2z.F7H@egr.uri.edu>,  
<930728.114323.7q4.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>, <238345\$cp4@senator-  
bedfellow.MIT.EDU>~  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

cthomas@athena.mit.edu (Michael T Ford) writes:

```
> #.----- - - - . . - - - - . . . . . - . - - - - . - - . . . . . - . . . . .
>
> . - - - . - . . . . . - . . . . - - . -
>
>
>
>
> -- . . . . . -- . . . . . -- . . . . . -- . . . . . -- . . . . .
```

[illegible]

— — — — —

o	o	Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op	441.750+, ARRL	VE
\	/	system @ garlic.sbs.com	Soon	W5YI VE

\_\_\_\_\_ (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.

```

/ | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || { } ||

```

||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
^^        ^^

-----

-----

Date: 30 Jul 93 12:04:46 GMT  
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308294872@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,  
<22hbg9INN6ju@bashful.isi.com>, <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com>~  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <22tqtk\$50e@news.delphi.com> greg1@news.delphi.com (Greg Law) writes:  
>Theory is important because amateur radio licensees are permitted to build  
>their own antennas and rigs. Amateur radio licensees are also expected to

By that logic, CW is important because amateur radio licencees are permitted  
to use CW on the air.

>be able to identify problems in the rigs before it becomes a problem. I

By that logic, it's a requirement to own a spectrum analyzer, a signal  
monitor, etc. It's also a requirement to have a tougher technical test  
to screen out those who don't understand the basics of emissions (e.g.,  
even though the "standard" NBFM signal is 5 KHz deviation, the signal is  
actually about 11 KHz wide, so it's illegal to transmit such signals on  
147.995), synthesizer noise, final-stage output filtering, mixer byproducts,  
etc. And since they're required to correct such problems before taking the  
equipment on the air again, they should at least be tested on the rudiments  
of tracking down such problems in their equipment.

>know I'm not particularly fond of the splatter and sporadic emissions  
>from various rigs -- particularly those of a few 11 meter rigs that were  
>played with by individuals that have no idea what they are doing.

Or overdeviation (sometimes from repeaters!!!) that splatters into the  
inputs of other repeaters than the one being used. Or overmodulation.  
Etc.

>Morse code is less important than it was several years ago, but it is still  
>an important mode of communication for amateur radio. I would personally like  
>to see Technician-class licensees have access to a small segment of a CW  
>band for code practice, but unfortunately it was declined.

It's been posted before, but I think you mean an HF CW band. Illegal by  
international treaty (which the FCC and ARRL are trying to oppose at the

WARC meetings, and have stated their intent to oppose again at the next WARC). Besides, a friend with his (code) Technician and I are working on some method of getting some of our ancient 6M gear up and running so that we can do code practice interactively around 50.05 MHz; he wants his Extra and I want to get my speed back up from 13 WPM to my 25-30 WPM of yore.

>Knowledge of these modes of communication is important because they are  
>available and you should know at least the basics of satellite and digital  
>communications before making the plunge.

By the same logic, knowledge of the legal system should be tested because legal means are available to challenge FCC decisions. A driver's license should be required because mobile operation is allowed. An applicant should be able to write out (in hexadecimal) sample packets in AX.25, AMTOR, RTTY, ROSE, and tcp/ip, complete with calculated checksums, and describe the KISS interface. They should be required to describe at least the rudiments of the methods of extremely fast frequency switching that make spread-spectrum use possible. Etc. And if you're going to include satellite operation, since people here have said that much of the satellite ops that go on are in CW, you've got to include CW.

Thanks for allowing the fact that CW is still an important mode of operation. I've personally NEEDED it on a few occasions when all other modes available to me were useless (because of rig problems, propagation, etc.). The sad fact is that those who don't learn the code will never know that, because it's not an alternative available to them, and the communication will be missed because of the lack of alternative communications.

As someone on the net previously put it so well: you may only need CW \_once\_ in your lifetime, but when you need it, you \_really\_ need it.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us  OR  clifto@indep1.uucp  |
|   WA9PDM     |                        Use whichever one works      |
+-----+
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #274

\*\*\*\*\*